

a balloon wall adapted to receive and hold fluids, the balloon wall extending upwardly from said valve body, said balloon wall having an inner diameter, while in a deflated state, which is larger than said valve stem diameter such that an annular space exists between said balloon wall and said valve stem while said balloon is deflated, said annular space provided to relieve stress from a union of said balloon wall and said valve body when said balloon is inflated;

Alb
cont. a piercing extending from said inlet, through said valve body and through said valve stem, into an inner chamber defined by said balloon, said piercing constructed and arranged to remain closed unless a substantially rigid member is pushed through said piercing, such as to inflate said balloon, whereby said piercing recloses after said member is withdrawn, thereby preventing a fluid from escaping from said inner chamber.

A version marked up to show changes made to the claim relative to the previous version of the claim is attached.

Remarks

The Office Action withdrew claims 20-51 and 62-88 from consideration. The drawing was objected to for a better showing of element 36. The specification was objected to for a variety of informalities. The title was objected to as well.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strother, U.S. Pat. No. 4,364,392 in view of Copenhaver et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,720,734. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strother and Copenhaver, and further in view of Dormandy, Jr., U.S. Pat. No. 4,819,637. Claims 11-19 and 52-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strother and Copenhaver, and further in view of Dormandy, Jr.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the careful review of the present application, as evidenced by the several informalities detected. This amendment is believed to correct those informalities and render the objections to the specification, title and drawings moot.

With respect to the restriction requirement, applicants respectfully submit that it is unduly harsh. The restriction requirement is tantamount to requiring five different patent applications for claims 1-88 of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that the